

Name - Mohammad Rashid Raza

Enrollment No - 194505382

Program Code - MAPY

Course Code - MPYE-002

Question 1

Explain the descriptive, normative and critical phases of environmental ethics. Also discuss the ~~very~~ why and why role of environmental ethics.

Environmental ethics is to deal with the problems of surrounding environmental protection. It aims to provide ethical judgement and justification and moral motivation for the cause of global environmental protection. Environmental ethics extends the traditional ethics scope and concerns not only the human but it includes animal and whole nature. Also this is interdisciplinary. There are many overlapping concerns and areas of consensus among environmental ethics, environmental politics, environmental economics, environmental science and literature. These distinct perspective and methodologies provide important inspiration for environmental ethics and environmental ethics offers value foundation for these disciplines. They reinforce, influence and support each other.

The overly increasing human population is increasing the human demand for resources like food, water, shelter. To fulfill our need we are cutting down forests for making our home and industries. we are continuing with an excessive consumption of natural resources. Their excessive use is resulting in their depletion and risking the life of our future generation.

Every year on June 4<sup>th</sup> we celebrate the world environment-day, we are encouraging our people to save the environment and resources which we have from nature. This was started in year 1972 by United nation.

Moral philosophers have found it useful to distinguish three level of study in their discipline.

1) Descriptive ethics - It consist of accounts of what people and their cultures do, in fact value. Imagine, a hypothetical public opinion survey reporting that 55% of Californians favor extraordinary and costly measures to protect and preserve their northern forests, that 30% oppose such measures and 15% are undecided. Since the survey reports the moral opinions of the sample population without offering a moral judgement of these beliefs, the poll is an exercise in descriptive ethics. Similarly, an anthropological report that Such and Such a tribe values head hunting describes the value of that tribe. Descriptive ethics then can be regarded as a specialized type of social science.

2) Normative ethics - It deals with moral issues in the conventional sense of that term that is with questions of right or wrong, duties and rights, justice and injustice, virtue and wickedness and so forth. This is also known as prescriptive ethics. On this level of ethics discourse judgements are made and defended concerning the moral value of policies. Also in particular cases, recommendations are made as to the morally best course of action or conduct. Thus a normative response to the hypothetical poll on the Northland forest might be "how dreadful that our fellow citizens should care so little about their biotic legacy", or on the other hand, "I am glad to see that our citizens are at last coming to their moral sense and recognizing that human being are more important than a bunch of trees. Similarly, one



might normatively condemn the practice of head hunting accurately described by the anthropologist.

3) Critical Ethics (Metaethics) - It is concerned with the meaning of ethical concepts and with the justification of normative claims. Thus environmental metaethics brings to policy and legislative debate such questions as these: upon what unstated moral assumptions are these contending positions based, are we now prepared to clarify a crucial distinction: "Environmental Ethics" is to be identified in this introduction as a metaethical term designating any ethical position that expresses a viewpoint concerning man's responsibility to nature. Ecological morality on the other hand identifies the particular normative environmental ethics of such writers as Aldo Leopold who view man as a part of natural community with duties of respect and forbearance towards that community.

### Why and why not?

Because we can't sit this one out. Not to decide about issues of environmental ethics is to decide in favor of the status quo and in favor of business as usual. But our poor battered, plundered and polluted planet can't long endure a continuation of business as usual. We have in past couple of centuries, achieved a cleverness that has far overshoot our wisdom. The explosive growth of scientific knowledge, followed shortly by a parallel growth in technical ingenuity has created an explosive growth in moral problems, some unprecedented in human history. Ethics is not something new. Ethics deals with the realm of imaginable human conduct that falls between the impossible and inevitable, that is within the area of human capacity and choice.

Our moral responsibility to nature and to the future is of unprecedented significance and urgency, and it is a responsibility that we can't escape. In our heretofore careless and capricious hands lies the fate of our natural environment, our brother species and the generations that will succeed us. Therein lies our inalienable dreadful challenge and our awesome responsibility.

### Question 2

Write an essay on human rights. Explain the importance of right to life. The initial part of rights were mainly freedom, security, property and resistance to oppression, which are inspired by liberalism and are considered as right to be protected against the state. Later version add the concern of dignity and wellbeing, which inspired by socialism in a broad sense, are considered as right to be guaranteed. The first generation human rights is civil and political rights. These rights of the individual to confront the state if it acts contrary to the political freedom of the citizens. These rights include civil liberties which guarantee freedoms to the individual to do anything in so far as it does not harm others, right to life prohibition of slavery, prohibition of torture and inhumanity, prohibition of arbitrary detention, freedom of marriage and of parenthood and right to private property. Political rights includes the right to vote, the right to resistance to oppression, the right of peaceful assembly including freedom of religion.

The second generation rights are rights that require government intervention to be implemented. The individual, unlike in the case of resistance, is here able to require that state to take some action. The state must guarantee some rights to its citizens in return for abandonment of a part of their freedoms. They are called social rights because they result from the experience of social struggles. Historically, most of the rights have been recognised in the aftermath of the Second



world war. Nevertheless, the right to work and to social protection was claimed at the outset of the French Revolution, 1789 and enshrined in the law in March 19, 1793, which states that every human person is entitled to his/her livelihood through work. If he/she is capable to work or through free relief if he/she is unable to work. The care of providing for the subsistence of the poor is national duty. Similarly, Article 21 of the Declaration of Human Rights ~~and~~ and citizen of 1793 affirms that the state owe subsistence to unfortunate citizens, either by providing labour or providing the means of existence for those who are unable to work. There is some conflict between right to safeguard against the state and the right to be guaranteed by the state. This is because of the opposition between two conceptions of human rights: liberal and socialist.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), which upholds rights such as right to social security (Article 22), right to work (Article 23) and right to education (Article 26) is accompanied by two United Nations international pacts on civil and political (first-generation human rights) and on Economics, social and cultural rights (second generation rights) December 16, 1966. Both pacts have rarely been signed together, the countries of the west block signed the first more willingly while those in Eastern bloc signed the second.

The third generation human rights ~~revolve~~ revolve around the fundamental principle of equality and non-discrimination. Some of the major concern are the environment law, considerations of bioethics, right to development and the right to peace.

The source of law in the field of human rights is the existence of the individual, while the source of law in democracies, by definition derives from the general will. When these two source of law conflict, society must find a balance and a way to reconcile these two imperatives. For example, we have freedom of expression but the criminal law prohibits marriage between brothers and sisters in many countries. The laws in these examples provided do not violate human right but this raises the difficult question of what acceptable limits that the law may impose on human rights in a democratic society governed by the right.

It is possible that democracy can come into conflict with human right. A democratic principle makes legitimate a priori any determination made in the popular will, and recognizes no higher authority than the rule of the people. Accordingly, there is no universally accepted philosophical political or legal ~~solution~~ solution as satisfactory of the majority of people, directly or through officers democratically elected, would support a policy contrary to human rights. A democratic state violate human rights. To avoid this, it is generally accepted that they must limit the sovereignty of the people by independent safeguards, a role often taken by the courts (at national level, by constitutional judge or Supreme courts).

**Right to life** - This is the most basic of all fundamental rights, in the sense that if one were to deny it all the others would have no meanings. Aquinas included it among the most basic practical first principles with human beings are endowed: indeed, as the natural urge for self-preservation, it is one of those metaphysical drives which we share with all beings. In as much as human life is, in a special way something that stems from God's personal creative act, it is something sacred and no one, for any purpose whatsoever can, therefore arrogate to himself or herself the right, for it is the basis of all the others and without it the rest would become derisory.

This does not mean that one cannot strike back, even kill, an unjust aggressor. The legitimate defense of individual persons as well as of societies, would allow on the right to do so.



Question 3  
A Make clear the distinction between values and norms.  
It seems prima facie that norms flow from value what is to be done come from what is good. If we have values, then we have norms. For example if we can make an evaluative statement "it is good to help the most-deprived" then naturally follows the prescriptive statement "we should help the most-deprived". Conversely it seems if we should not do something, the necessary implication would be that this something is bad: "It is horrible to lie", would imply that lying is bad. This can suggest that in the last analysis there is equivalence between values and norms: an action is good if and only if it should be done.

Firstly, all evaluation and evaluative statements are not related to actions, whereas all normative statements are related to actions. Only actions are prohibited or obligated. We cannot prohibit the Mount Everest - nor can we prohibit suffering, but on the contrary we can be stupefied at the sight of the former and we can deplore the latter. The applicability of values is broader than that of norms. There is thus a vital distinction between these two. How can we pass from value to ethical norms? If an action is good then it should be done but if a state of affairs or an agent is good, the what is to be done? For ex., what should be done once we know that happiness is good? There is a consequentialist response according to which our moral action should be such that it paves way to the maximum of intrinsic values. For consequentialist philosophies even if there is a reciprocal implication between value and norms, that doesn't justify their identification: once again a statement that something is beautiful is no way expresses an obligation.

Secondly Certain non ethical factors prevents us from deriving norms from values. It is good to clean the floor implies that it is an obligation to clean the floor but only if it is possible to do so. Such possibility depends on certain conditions like if there is a vacuum cleaner, if the agent in question has the physical abilities to do it. The idea that the ability to carry out an action is a necessary condition to the obligation of that action can be justified as follows: there is a close connection between concept of ability and fault. However we cannot reproach someone not to have done something that is not within his ability. Nor can we reproach him/her for an action which he/she could not but do. If we must act, then not to act implies being exposed to reproaches. Therefore, we are obliged only if we have the ability to act. It then follows that norms are not directly derived from value: we should do what is good in so far as we can do it. Equivalence between norms and values is therefore objectionable.

3  
D what do you understand by cultural and ethical Subjectivism?

There is a quite understandable objection that any kind of ethical system based on human nature (however adequately considered) has to face and that stems from the undeniable fact of cultural relativism. In one culture polygamy is viewed as right and moral; in another it is roundly condemned; not too long ago certain tribes in South Sea Islands considered the painless killing of ones parents a filial duty, most of us would be horrified at the very idea. Sometime within the same country or culture there are splits: Some Indians disapprove of the remarriage of widows, others have no problem with it.

Study of Anthropology and Sociology have led us to accept cultural relativism: there is no one culture which can be seen as superior to others, we are told. Each culture makes sense, is sufficient unto it self within its own religious and philosophical presuppositions. It would be grossly unfair for one culture to arrogate to it self the right to stand on judgement on another one. Kant was determined that his system of ethics have an autonomous source. Basing moral conduct on external grounds the will of God or of positive law would be



to ask for trouble. An atheist would be deprived of any moral foundation and positive law would scarcely help matters.

Furthermore, sense perception is a necessary constituent of human nature and this in itself opens the door to certain relativisms. Now this open door to a whole range of divergence within and between cultures. For if all people are seeing, hearing, smelling and tasting the same objects they are not necessarily apprehending them in the same way. There is a possibility of acquired tastes, and some people acquire them while others do not.

However not all cultural differences can be reduced to the mere relativeness of our perception of things. Sometimes it stems from a broader and wider interpretation of whole complexes of interrelated experiences. A particular local, regional or even national customs or rite may imply a judgement that people of a particular gender, ethnic or religious background are either non-persons or rather inferior version of the species. As a result, they are disqualified from enjoying certain privileges and rights that another dominant group claims exclusively for it. In cases such as these, where a clear ethical bias is manifest, one has every right to challenge and criticise the culture concerned. Cultural differences based on questionable hierarchies and implying about discrimination against certain people cannot justify itself on the grounds of cultural differences.

Question 4 Briefly discuss the right to life.

B Right of life is basic and most fundamental rights of human, ~~no~~ no one can deny it, all the others would have no meanings. Aquinas included it among the most basic practical first principles with which human being are endowed. Indeed as the natural urge for self-preservation, it is one of those metaphysical drives which we share with all beings. In as much as human life is, in a special way something that stems from God's personal creative act. Even an atheist would have good reason to respect this right, for it is basis of all the others and without it the rest would become diversionary.

Helder Camara teaches us, in his Spiral of violence, to be wary of definitely biased understanding of the term that vested interests and power project. One must recognise three types of violence: structural violence, institutional violence and repressive violence. In most cases, whether the people revolt or not, depends on how widespread and horrendous is the oppression they are facing. Eventually, when they are convinced that they cannot take it anymore, that all reasonable bounds have been crossed they make some desperate resolve to the effect that it would be better to go down fighting rather than die by degrees amidst the humiliation of their women and children? For the most part they are well aware that they have no chance - underfed, untrained and poorly equipped against a few well fed, well trained and well armed regulars.

4

C

Briefly discuss the distributive justice. Justice is very important for a peaceful society and life. Market economies, salary and wage structures and tax systems, judicial system prisons and so on are all part to be evaluated in terms of their compliance with principles of justice.

Distributive justice is essentially a relational phenomenon to do with the comparative distribution of benefits and burdens as between individual or groups, including the distribution of rights and duties but not restricted to the distribution of rights and duties. e.g. the injustice of excluding black (but not white), Muslim (but not Hindus) from voting in elections to determine the national government in apartheid South Africa or of lower wages being paid to women than those paid to men for the same work.



However, distributive justice does not appear to be a defining feature and/or function of all social institutions. Communication systems, such as human language, are arguably defined in part in terms of the end of truth, but not in terms of justice; hence a communicative system would cease to be a communication system if its participants never attempt to communicate the truth but not if its participants failed to respect principles of distributive justice.

There is at least one important and uncontroversial principle of distributive justice that arises in the context of collective enterprises (joint action); namely that other things being equal the benefits produced by the joint actions should flow back to those who performed the joint action.

4  
D

Distinguish between the human order and the moral order.

Analysis of the immediate data of moral consciousness are repeatedly draw attention to the fact that we were not referring to any particular and concrete human good and bad action. Now however if we reflect on what actions we and people in general consider to be morally good or bad we notice that by far the greater number are actions which have something to do directly or indirectly with men's relation among themselves.

There are indeed certain actions which have nothing to do at least at first sight with human person's relation among themselves and which we call good or bad implying awareness that they should be performed or avoided. And in the sense they too can be considered moral actions. These actions have got to do either with human person's relation with God or with human person's relation with himself/herself or finally relation with intra-human world (animals). With regards to action of human to animal world, it is true that kindness to animals for example can be looked at as a morally right quality even a virtue and its opposite cruelty to them a morally wrong one. Human inter-relatedness is at least the immediate ontological foundation of the moral order.

4  
F

Write a short note on Media and Social responsibility.

Media ethics is given a broader concept of social responsibility. In presenting the facts and news around globe the media is expected to have certain responsibility inherent within or imposed upon namely responsibility towards the society to which it serves. This question arises when media reported certain controversies without foreseeing the consequences that would follow. Every one is entitled to have information when the information is passed on media personnel their own perspective to present. In certain cases the presentation of certain facts may have negative impact. Hence media personnel should not put their own perspective while passing the information to readers and viewers.

~~Accountability~~ Accountability in the media is often defined in terms of producing records like evidence to support what has been reported. The journalist is accountable in the sense s/he is held liable for the consequences of the reporting. The liability is both in ethical and legal in nature. Responsibility for the act of reporting is on the journalist.

Responsibility is in this sense the obligation for proper custody, care and safekeeping of one's audience. In social responsibility the interest of the society is given a top priority. From the Commission on the freedom of the press or the Hutchins Commission the following five guidelines are briefly given for a free and responsible press. These principles though valid are lacking in precision.

1) A truthful, comprehensive and intelligent account of the day's events in



a context which gives them meaning

- 2) A forum for the exchange of comment and criticism.
- 3) The projection of a representative picture of the constituent group in the society.
- 4) The presentation and clarification of the goals and values of the society.
- 5) Full access to the day's intelligence.

Social responsibility is an obligation of the media to provide trustworthy and relevant news and information as well as opportunities for diverse voice to be heard in the public arena. It is to see that all sides are fairly presented and that the public has enough information to decide.

### Questions

A

Svadharma — By this term we mean each individual has to grow to his best according to his own dharma, that is to say the principle of individual growth is called Svadharma. Svadharma is in relation to an individual's temperament and stage and duties in life, based on varna and ashrama. It is made in terms of three gunas, the purity, vividity and darkness. These three qualities are found in each individual in varying proportion and thus this varying proportion of qualities is regarded as the basis of different type of actions and of four castes. It is well promoted by Indian ethical code that if the society is to function smoothly there should certainly be a hierarchical arrangement of functions and duties in it.

D

Pancasila (Five Precepts) — Buddhism invites the lay Buddhists to adopt five precepts voluntarily to follow in order to live together in civilized communities with mutual trust and respect. Following the precepts helps the lay Buddhist to make a spiritual journey towards liberation. These are purely voluntary ones. A good Buddhist should remind himself to follow the five precepts daily they are as follows —

- 1) I take the training rule to refrain from killing living creatures.
- 2) Taking which is not given
- 3) Sexual misconduct
- 4) False speech
- 5) Taking intoxicating drugs and liquor.

The precepts are basic practice in Buddhism. They are also an indispensable basis for people who wish to cultivate their minds. Without some basic moral code the power of meditation can often be applied for some wrong and selfish motive.

F

Personhood — It is human person's ~~person~~ social dimension, a dimension which is not superimposed on human person's already constituted being as a human person, but which is a dimension constitutive of his human being as such. It is not merely that human person need other to be born, to develop physically, intellectually and to live a happy and useful life, but that he needs to be recognised by others as a fellow human as a person. Therefore and not as an object to be made use of by other men to alter consciousness of himself as a human person. This is no modern discovery. The Aristotelian-Thomistic doctrine has insisted all along that human person is a social animal. If there is anything new is the emphasis and ~~central~~ centrality given it by modern psychology, the behavioural science, sociology and ~~the~~ personalistic philosophy. It is not just the juxtaposition of human individuals as if there were self-enclosed individual monads, nor is it the conscious and deliberated choice of certain number of men choosing to live together in essential dependence of human



Person another human person.

5g  
Existentialist Humanism - Existentialism is not so atheistic that it were itself out showing that God doesn't exist but taking the non-existence of God for granted it tries to draw all possible conclusions from a logically coherent atheism. Jean Paul Sartre is the philosopher who was succeeded to give expression of this. If there are no pre-existing essences on which to build a moral order and no pre-existing norms according to which human persons can pass moral judgement s/he is free and left on his/her own to create their own moral values. Sartre defends his moral stance against the accusations that it is inhuman. For Sartre his existentialism is indeed humanism in the sense that it alone can promote the dignity of human persons which consists precisely in human freedom. And human person is responsible to others in that when he acknowledges and chooses freedom he is by that very fact acknowledging and choosing freedom for others.

Human person as a conscience being is different from a thing in that he is free. A thing is static, fixed, opaque to itself determined and therefore definable. If human person had his essence already pre-fabricated for him he would be a thing and his human dignity would be done away with. But his essence is what he himself makes of his existence in freedom.

5e  
Teleology - Teleology finds its etymology in the Greek word telos which means 'end' and logos 'science'. It refers to final purpose and as a theory it explains and justifies values in reference to some final purpose or good. It is a theory that derive duty and moral obligation from what is good or desirable as an end to be achieved. The central concept of teleological account of social institutions is that of joint action. Joint actions consist of the intentional individual actions of a number of agents directed to the realisation of collective end. A collective end is a species of individual end; it is an end possessed by each individual involved in the joint action. Joint actions are the action which ~~are~~ is performed by two or more people. Organisations is that organisational action typically consist in what has elsewhere been termed, a layered structure of joint action. It should also be that social norms governing the roles and role structures of organisations are both formal and informal. If formal, then they are typically enshrined in explicit rules regulations and laws including laws of contract.